

REMARKS

In response to the Quayle Action, applicant respectfully notes that the present application is the national stage application of PCT/JP2005/006545. Therefore, unity of invention standards are applicable. Unity of invention exists where there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. In the present application, allowed claims 1, 3 and 7 relate to a defined dendron. Claims 8-14 relate to a defined dendrimer (which is formed of a dendron as explained in the specification). Thus, by amending claim 8 so that the same groups are defined in the same manner as in claim 1 (but with reference to a dendrimer consistent with the description provided at page 1, lines 26-27 and page 8, lines 3-12) and by canceling claims 9 and 11-13 in the same manner as claims 2 and 4-6 were previously canceled, applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 10 and 14 are similarly allowable (claims 10 and 14 reciting the same subject matter as claims 3 and 7).

Former claims 15-28 were method claims. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 1, so that such claim, as well as method claims 16-19 which depend therefrom should be rejoined and allowed in the present application either under the unity of invention standards or under the rejoinder provisions as set forth in MPEP §821.04(b). Similarly, method claim 20 has been made dependent on allowed claim 3 and should also be allowed. New claim 29 parallels claim 20, but relates to a method of producing the dendrimer of claim 10 and should likewise be allowable in the same manner as claim 20. Claims 21 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Method claims 25 and 27 were formerly dependent on now-canceled claim 21 and have now been made dependent on claims 10 and 3, respectively, as well as

being amended to include the subject matter of former claim 21. Claims 25 and 27, as well as the method claims now dependent thereon should also be rejoined and allowed. In this latter respect, method claims 23 and 24 have been made dependent on claim 25 and new dependent method claims 30 and 31, which parallel claims 23 and 24, but are dependent on claim 27, have been added.

Since all of the claims have been amended to include the subject matter of the previously allowed claims or the method claims have been amended to refer to allowed or allowable claims, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now of record are allowable and therefore request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the present application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

By:


Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28531

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620

Date: December 22, 2010